

REMARKSClaim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abramovici et al. (US 6,108,806), in view of Andrews et al. (US 6,064,225), in further view of Kean (US 6,292,018).

For a §103 obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. MPEP 2143.

Amended Claim 1 recites a method of testing the routing circuitry in a field programmable gate array (FPGA), wherein the method comprises “obtaining an actual result by applying said set of test inputs to said routed network, wherein said set of test inputs are applied such that adjacent tracks in said first set of tracks have different logic values and adjacent tracks in said second set of tracks have different logic values”

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art fails to disclose a set of test inputs being applied such that adjacent tracks in a first set of tracks have different logic values and adjacent tracks in a second set of tracks have different logic values, as recited in Claim 1. Applicants cannot find any mention of this limitation in the cited prior art.

Applicants respectfully submit that Examiner has failed to establish that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art. Therefore, Applicants

respectfully submit that Claim 1 is non-obvious over Abramovici in view of Andrews, and in further view of Kean.

The same arguments made above with respect to the patentability of Claim 1 are applicable to the patentability of Claims 2 and 3 as well.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-3 are currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abramovici, in view of Wells et al. (US 6,651,238), in further view of Andrews and Kean.

The same arguments made above with respect to the patentability of Claim 1 are applicable to the patentability of Claim 4 as well.

Since Claim 5 depends from Claim 4, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 5 is also patentable as it contains the same limitations as Claim 4.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 4 and 5 are currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Amendment to the Claims

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to Claims 1-4 find support in the application as originally filed. Specifically, support is found on Page 29, lines 8-18 and Page 30, lines 5-15 of the specification. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been introduced by the amendments to the claims and that the claims are currently in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this application, the Examiner may telephone the undersigned at 775-586-9500.

Respectfully submitted,
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.

Dated: August 15, 2006

/jonathan d. hanish/

Jonathan D. Hanish
Reg. No.: 57,821

Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.
1657 Hwy. 395, Suite 202
Minden, NV 89423
(775) 586-9500
(775) 586-9550 Fax